DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 470 423 EA 032 063

AUTHOR	Stine, David O.; Stine, Deborah E.
TITLE	The Reform and Reconstitution of the Educational Administration Program in California: A Study of Politics, Posturing, and the Devaluation of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	2002-08-00
NOTE	26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (56th, Burlington, VT, August 5-10, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Politics of Education; Private Agencies
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

During the last 30 years, the state of California has had a great obsession with determining appropriate preparation programs for public school administrators. In all reform cases, the alterations have come in the name of strong leadership, school improvement, quality leadership, and instructional leadership. Political posturing has been evident, as elected officials have wanted to be considered the saviors of the state's children. One outcome of this series of reforms is the devaluation of the university as a provider of appropriate school administrator education programs by introducing private-provider organizations and agencies. Recognizing the political posturing and the advocacy efforts that have been made, it is clear that there is a need for guidelines to assist in implementing new reform measures. Among recommendations are that the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing must play an objective role to maintain high standards in the approval, monitoring, and accreditation of programs; that programs need to provide meaningful balance of theory and practice, including field experience; that measures must be taken to coordinate programs to avoid duplication and yet still meet preparation standards; and that no new, additional programs or initiatives should be approved unless they are coordinated with or replace existing programs. (Contains 18 references.) (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 470 423

The Reform and Reconstitution of the Educational Administration Program in California: A Study of Politics, Posturing, and the Devaluation of Higher Education

David O. Stine

Deborah E. Stine

California State University, San Bernardino

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. E. STINE

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Paper presented to the 56th Annual Conference of the National Council of Principals of Educational Administration (NCPEA), *Professors and Practitioners: Building Bridges Through Leadership,* Burlington, Vermont, August 5 – 10, 2002. Presenters may be contacted at: California State University, San Bernardino, School of Education, 5500 University Avenue, San Bernardino, CA. 92407. E-mail: dstined@aol.com

EA 032 063

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Reform and Reconstitution of the Educational Administration Program in California: A Study of Politics, Posturing, and the Devaluation of Higher Education

During the last 30 years, the state of California has had a great obsession with determining the appropriate preparation programs for public school administrators. The governor, the state Superintendent of Public Instruction, the legislature, the administrators' professional organizations, and the state's licensing agency have all exercised their influence to change, modify, and reconstitute the credentialing programs. In all cases, the alterations have come in the name of *strong leadership, school improvement, quality leadership,* and now in the name of *instructional leadership* and improved student achievement. Each of the initiatives has been based on the firm belief that it would be the political answer to save the public schools. Each would be the panacea to provide the impetus for a better, more effective education for our children. In addition, many county offices of education and local school districts have initiated their own staff development programs for their administrators. Reform movements have included higher standards and specific competencies, while at the same time suggesting internships and testing to fast-track the administrative credential. The political posturing has been evident, as elected officials in each decade have wanted to be considered the saviors of our children's education. The real question might be, can we maintain quality in the preparation program and at the same time expedite the process to provide fully prepared competent candidates to serve in our public schools?

The Reform Process Begins

Prior to 1970, the credentialing system had accumulated a collection of administrative credentials that included the Elementary Administrative, the Secondary Administrative, the General Administrative, and even a Standard Supervision credential. The *Teacher Preparation and Licensing Act of 1970*, also known as the *Ryan Act*, condensed all of the former administrative credentials into a single Administrative Services Credential that authorized any type of administrative service at any grade level, K-12. All of these credentials were issued for life. It was also at this historic time, according the Bartell & Birch (1993), that the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing was formed to monitor and oversee the credential process for all California educators. The agency has gone through a name change during this process, from the original Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC) to the state specific title of California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CCTC). The fast-track simplification of all of the former specific administrative credentials issued by the CTC allowed for a waiver of the entire preparation program through the successful passing of a written test; the testing lasted from 1973 to 1979. Unfortunately, no data files were kept recording the number of candidates who took or passed the test – the pass rate of this endeavor is unavailable. All individuals who passed the test or completed the approved educational program were issued the same credential and the testing was subsequently discontinued.

It was during this same timeframe (1974) that the guidelines for the administrative internship program were adopted. The admission requirements for the intern program were the same as the academic program and all competencies were similar. Currently,

there are 19 institutions of higher education that have CCTC approved intern programs, and the majority of the programs are offered by independent or private universities.

The process for change has, at least superficially, been motivated by the compelling interest in improving the leadership training, while at the same time providing alternative provisions to avoid the academic preparation. One consistent factor can be noted of this process: all the initiatives have sought to balance theory with practical application. The internship, field experiences, shadowing activities, and peer support are all found in each of the programs, except when students are exempt through an approved testing. The examination advocates have often stated that the core of information in the "Knowledge Base" can be verified by testing; they point to the fact that the best way to learn how to do a job is to do it. These same advocates espouse the availability of mentoring for the new administrator during the induction process. The debate goes on, but there have been other issues that have emerged from the legislature regarding school administrators. One of the pervasive questions is: Should the preparation of school administrators be the exclusive responsibility of higher education or should there be multiple providers and various pathways to certification?

According to Bartell & Birch (1993), Assemblyman Dennis Mangers received legislative approval in 1977 to establish the Assembly Education Committee Task Force to study the pre-service and in-service training for administrators. This 60 member group found several other issues to deal with, including recruitment and selection policies, ongoing professional development, additional support services from districts, county offices, and universities, and the new evaluation process. These critical issues were later

complemented with charges for school-based intensive field experiences, additional renewal requirements, and consideration for meaningful in-service training. The more that the programs were changed and reformed, the more it was obvious that there were no simple answers to ensure that there would be well-qualified, knowledgeable, effective instructional leaders and competent managers serving in our schools.

The Creative Solution

After decades of talking about pre-service, induction, on-going lifelong learning, staff development, field experiences, and the credential renewal process, the Commission sponsored a bill in 1981 that attempted to meet the criteria that had been identified that needed to be included in a new credential system. With "Life" credentials, it was found that some students earned a degree and qualified for a credential early in their career with no intention of taking an administrative position immediately; some candidates sought the units of university credit to simply advance on the teacher salary schedule. Others chose to raise their families before they considered the time intensive realm of school administration. The thoughtful solution to the concern of dated preparation was a two-tier credential with Tier I as a pre-service preparation of the knowledge base, and Tier II, to be required only when the candidate secured a position in administration. The Administrative Code Title 5 regulations were finally adopted and the new program went into effect in July of 1985.

The Tier II Credential was a partial solution to the recommendation of the National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration that stated,

> The licensure procedure must ensure quality in school leadership. The Commission recommends that applicants for licensure be limited to persons who

have completed a state-approved program, passed rigorous written and oral examinations, and shown competence in either simulated or actual work settings. (1988, p. 22)

The new program provided the rigorous academic program for pre-service which included multiple measures of evaluation, concrete standards, and experiences in the field at school sites in both elementary and secondary settings. Part two of the program was a continuous learning on-the-job and participation in a seminar-based induction and education program. The dimension of induction included the agreement on the content of the elective portion of the Second Tier between the candidate, the university professor, and the site mentor. The elective aspect was one third of that program and was designed to fit the needs of each individual in his/her setting. The electiveportion could include district in-service, staff development delivered by professional organizations, additional university classes, or a custom-developed plan. This was the beginning of an eventual trend to have other providers of training other than the universities. The elective portion of the program was to be designed by the three key professionals who would need to agree in this collaborative effort. During the completion of the coursework, the student would benefit from the expertise of both the site mentor and the professor.

The new Two-Tier Credential program seemed to fit the profile that was at the time being established by the National Association of Elementary School Principals (1990), stating, "The neophyte principal should be assisted by a support system that includes the university, the school district and a professional association" (p. 21). Two of the specific learning activities that were approved statewide were the California School Leadership Program (CSLA) and the Association of California School Administrators

(ACSA) Academies. As we will see later, both of these entities have established in-service training programs.

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction Becomes a Major Player

In 1984, through the vigorous leadership of Dr. Bill Honig, the elected Superintendent of Public Instruction, Senate Bill 813 was passed and was declared a major reform effort for all of California education. It is said that one of Dr. Honig's visions was to have a dramatic impact on every principal in the state. He promoted this separately funded initiative throughout the state and it resulted in the initial establishment of 13 Administrative Training Centers (ATC). The program was called the California School Leadership Academy (CSLA) and funded at $5 million dollars per year. It became operational in 1986 and was designed as a three-year research-based program to supplement the training that administrators had experienced at the universities. The original concept was to balance cohorts of individuals by designating specific groups with the following make up: 60% site administrators with 1-3 years experience, 20% site administrators with 4 or more years, and the remaining 20% was reserved for teachers with administrative credentials who were aspiring to become principals. Districts were required to provide release time and the cost to districts was $100-$300 per student in cash or "in kind" services or materials.

In keeping with the objectives of school improvement of the 70's, a school improvement plan was one of the mandates of the CSLA. The content of the program evolved to include core module workshops in the first year, followed in the second year with follow-through support and networking, and concluding the third year with a comprehensive school improvement project. Each year included 15 days of training.

Although it was considered a relevant experience, many districts chose not to participate because of he number of days teachers and administrators would need to be absent from their school sites.

In spite of time demands, the CSLA program has survived state funding challenges and is regarded as a relevant, meaningful supplement to the university programs. Currently, core programs are divided into three parts – Foundations, Ventures and School Leadership Teams. The primary focus of the CSLA programs is on increasing student achievement and closing the achievement gap, according to Carolyn Bainer, Executive Director of the San Bernardino and Inyo Counties CSLA program (personal communication, July 21, 2002). The content of the Foundations program includes Assessment, Curriculum, Instruction, Culture, Systems, Diversity, Professional Development and Managing and Aligning Resources. There is some question how such a heterogeneous audience of teachers, new administrators who have just completed a formal university preparation program, and experienced leaders could all benefit equally from this experience.

The second part of the CSLA program is the Ventures portion for experienced administrators. Its focus is on action research. Participants study their own schools with the purpose of improving student achievement.

Part three is designed for the development of School Leadership Teams. The principal and key teacher leaders learn how to collaborate together examining ways to improve achievement and close the gap between high and low achieving students.

Professional Development as Provided by the Administrators' Association (ACSA)

Thirty-six years ago the several state organizations, which served public school administrators in California, combined into one – the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA). One of this organization's primary goals was to provide a variety of programs, services, and professional development to meet the needs of its members. Unlike many other organizations, ACSA served confidential personnel and classified managers, as well as site and district certificated administrators.

Although ACSA offered many workshops, seminars, and training activities, the most noteworthy of the professional development programs were the academies. In the beginning there were five basic types of academies – focused on Superintendents, Principals, Personnel Administrators, Curriculum and Instructional Leaders, and Business Managers. Currently, in addition to these academies, there are nine academies with specific ones meeting the needs of Classified Educational Leaders, Pupil Services Administrators, and Superintendents of districts less Than 2,500 and leaders in Special Education. Multiple sessions of the same academy are offered throughout the state at regional locations and at various times to accommodate individuals who need to make-up sessions missed.

All academies provide opportunities for individuals who are in the positions specified, or who aspire to them. The programs have a standard format of three speakers per Friday evening and all day Saturday. Presenters are practitioners or retired administrators. It is estimated that approximately 500 individuals participate in the academies each year.

Selected academies have been approved statewide for the elective portion of the Professional Administrative Services Credential (Tier II). This was also true for the CSLA Program. It is now apparent that both ACSA and CSLA are interested in providing additional staff development programs to be used in lieu of the university-based Administrative Services Credential Program. Although the CSLA is funded primarily through the state budget, the academies are paid for by the participants and are a profit center for the association, although some districts pay the fees for their administrators and ACSA does provide some scholarships. In 2002-03 there will be eighteen academies offered throughout the state. With their programs in place, both CSLA and ACSA are seeking to provide a greater part of administrator preparation.

The State Teacher Induction Program to Include Administrators

One of the most effective staff development programs sponsored by the state of California has been the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program (BTSA) which was initiated in 1996. It was designed to provide specific assistance to new teachers, many of whom were on emergency credentials or enrolled in pre-tern or intern programs. The goal was to support all first and second year teachers in a two-year induction program. The services were designed at the state level and delivered through collaborative efforts of county offices of education or large school districts and higher education. According to Childress (2002), the program is currently funded at $90 million dollars per year.

As the program flourished, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing approved a new set of standards. In 1997, the California Standards for the Teaching Profession (CSTP) were adopted and then incorporated into the BTSA training. As the

program continued to evolve and improve, it was determined that the site administrators who were supervising and evaluating these new teachers needed to be knowledgeable about the BTSA program. It was felt that a program for principals would provide a common language and a clearer basis for analyzing a teacher's practice and assessing its impact on student learning. Again, this program was another example of an additional initiative to train administrators. The Annual Report of BTSA 2000-2001 (as cited in Childress, 2001), indicated that 26,500 out-of-state teachers, 14,200 support providers (mentors) and 8,100 site administrators participated in 145 local BTSA programs. Fifty-four of the 58 counties in California and 834 of the 1,000 school districts were involved. Although there was collaboration with teacher preparation faculty, there was an absence of professors of educational administration. Currently BTSA has submitted a proposal to deliver a part of the latest principal training program sponsored by the governor.

The Governor's Administrative Training Initiative

In the year 200o, the California Governor, Gray Davis, continued to tout himself as the "Education Governor" for the public schools in general, and in an attempt to fulfill his legacy, he promoted a training program for principals to complement all of the programs for teacher education, underperforming schools, and bonuses for individual successful teachers and schools. As mentioned previously, there already was a two-tiered administrative credentialing program offered through the universities and accredited by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, a state funded principal staff development program, California School Leadership Academy, organizational professional development sponsored by ACSA, and another state funded Principal/Site Administrator Training Program delivered by the Beginning Teacher Support and

Assessment program. Currently, any program that counts toward completion of an administrative credential must be reviewed and accredited by the CCTC. Although these four programs have many similarities, they are not fully coordinated or integrated into a meaningful administrator preparation program.

Another legislative effort, Assembly Bill 75 has passed and has been signed by the governor. AB 75 (Steinberg) Chaptered October 2001 (Chapter 697) establishes the Principal Training Program to provide incentive funding for Local Education Agencies (LEAs) to train school-site administrators. It requires the State Board of Education (SBE) to develop criteria for the approval of training providers, in consultation with the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC), and other experts, including a representative of CTC, to provide input in their areas of expertise and review criteria for the approval of training providers. Advisory Group meetings also provided time for comments from the public. Suffice it to say, this has resulted in extremely prescriptive and complex requirements.

AB 75 requires that principals receive training in the following Content Areas,

1) School financial and personnel management.
2) Core academic standards.
3) Curriculum frameworks and instructional materials aligned to the state academic standards.
4) The use of pupil assessment instruments, specific ways of mastering the use of assessment data from the Standardized Testing and Reporting Program, and school management technology to improve pupil performance.

5) The provision of instructional leadership and management strategies regarding the use of instructional technology to improve pupil performance.

6) Extension of the knowledge, skills, and abilities acquired in the preliminary administrative program that is designed to strengthen the ability of administrators to serve all pupils in the school to which they are assigned.

AB 75 Content Areas (a) (1) through (6) are required by law: AB 75 Content Area (b) below is optional.

(b) The additional instruction and training areas that may be considered to improve pupil learning and achievement based upon the needs of participating school site administrators, include pedagogies of learning, motivating pupil collaboration, conflict resolution, diversity, parental involvement, employee relations, and the creation of effective learning and workplace environments.

First priority for the use of AB 75 and related funding is given to key administrative staff in "low-performing schools" and "hard to staff" schools" to address the professional development needs of these schools. Key administrative staff includes principals and vice principals. For each administrator trained, LEAs receive $3000. A $1000 match from the LEA is required. The casual observer might wonder why a fully credentialed administrator would want to go to an under-performing school and be required to participate in two additional years of training.

Training for the AB 75 Content Areas will be provided in two phases, an Institute and Follow-Up Practicum. The entire training program is divided into 3 modules, with

each module including guidelines for both the Institute phase and the Follow-Up Practicum phase. The modules are aligned with general competencies. Providers may apply for training in one or more modules. Providers may only provide training for modules for which they have been approved for by the State Board of Education. LEAs may also use an external provider for one or two modules, and apply to be their own provider for the remaining modules). Given this flexibility, the SBE encourages providers to develop and seek approval for complete programs in order to be able to offer a complete training package to the LEAs. This will be an attractive option for many LEAs, especially those representing small or medium size districts.

The three modules are:

Module 1: Leadership & Support of Student Instructional Programs

Module 2: Leadership & Management for Instructional Improvement

Module 3: Instructional Technology to Improve Pupil Performance

Recently, in the July 1, 2002, *Ed Cal*, ACSA Educational Services executive, Leslie Anderson, stated, "Having received word that it will be approved as a training provider, ACSA is preparing to offer the curriculum for AB 75 Modules 2 and 4. Although the content areas are very specific under the Principal Training Program, ACSA will design specific training plans for each district or county office of education." (p. 1). She added,

> Districts or counties looking for a training provider should note that participating in these trainings is voluntary. In order to receive professional learning under the Principal Training Program, local educational agencies must apply for state grant money and contract with approved providers. The only exceptions are those schools participating in the High Priority Schools Grant Program or schools that

will participate in the federal *Reading First* program. Although the schools that have received the grant money are required to participate in all three modules, they do not have to complete them in any order. (p. 2)

The Legislature Expands the Opportunities

As if the Governor's three-year program were not enough, three additional bills have been initiated in 2001-2002. If principals needed more training, then superintendents probably did too, and it is interesting to note that superintendents in California public schools need no credentials, degrees, or formal preparation to serve as a school district's Chief Executive Officer. In fact, non-educators lead two of California's largest districts, Los Angeles and San Diego.

In Los Angeles the school board selected former Colorado Governor Ray Romer. In San Diego, U. S. Attorney Alen Bersin was selected. However, California is not alone in its selection of non-educators for the position of superintendent; in New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg has just selected former Justice Department prosecutor Joe Klein and in Chicago, its chief business official Paul Vallas was selected as superintendent. In his Los Angeles Times article on July 30, 2002, Josh Getlin reflected, "Critics said it isn't yet cleat that non-educators can overcome the deep-seated problems of illiteracy, eroding discipline and shrinking budgets in the public school system. Bloomberg and others, however, say public schools need the managerial savvy and no-nonsense approach of business experts" (p. A8). It is interesting to note that Alan Bersin, a non-educator and current superintendent of the second largest school district in California is also serving as the Chair of The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Assembly Bill 5440 (Steinberg) has gotten mixed reviews as some superintendents expressed there was no need for more preparation programs because ACSA and CSLA have training in place. Superintendent Jim Brown of Napa Valley Unified School District, and former president of ACSA, is quoted as saying, "This voluntary program appears to be a waste of valuable state and local dollars in that it basically duplicates at a much higher cost – the two primary staff development programs designed by ACSA specifically for superintendents" (Legislature, 2002, p. 1). Brown went on to say, "I believe providing Institutions of Higher Education with yet another opportunity to enlighten educators who have been in the field some time is highly questionable. Other non-public educational institutions, including ACSA and CSLA, among others, are just as capable of delivering important professional development programs as Institutions of Higher Education" (p. 2). This quotation in the ACSA publication, *Ed Cal*, by a former president of the organization leads us to believe that ACSA should be the primary deliverer of professional preparation for administrators. It is interesting to note that California public and independent university credential programs employ thousands of current and retire administrators to complement the higher education faculty and to ensure relevancy. The most recent update of AB 5440 in the ACSA publication *Ed Cal* (Amendments, 2002, p. 3) note that the advocacy efforts by the organization have been successful in making the program completely voluntary and "Participants in the superintendent's training can decide, with agreement of their local school boards, particular areas in which they would like training" (p. 3).

Another initiative being promoted in 2002 has been SB 859, the school business officials training program. It has received little attention; this may be because the

California Association of School Business Officials (CASBO) has its own Chief Business Official (CBO) program and an accrediting process. It is a broad-based program with nine semester units in Core Classes, ten units in Skill Areas, four units of Practicum, and seven units of selected electives. CASBO's requirement is that units must be taken from accredited university programs and their approved staff development seminars. In their marketing brochure, CASBO endorses the Master's Degree in School Business Administration at California State University, Los Angeles; California State University, Sacramento, and Pepperdine University. Other approved programs in school business managements are CSU Fresno, CSU Fullerton, CSU San Bernardino, Sonoma State, and the University of California at Riverside. CASBO's endorsement of these programs throughout the state at both public and private institutions demonstrates its collaborative efforts in working with universities.

The collaborative effort of CASBO extends to recognize training programs from CASBO, ACSA, Association of School Business Officials International, and the California School Boards Association. This broad based cooperative effort spans the differences between the academic learning at universities and practical professional development delivered by associations. CASBO reviews and accredits all classes, seminars, and workshops that it recommends. The organization serves classified personnel and managers involved in the public schools and focuses on the business factions of budgeting, accounting, maintenance, operations, personnel, purchasing, transportation, food services and others.

The Reform Initiative By The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing

The California Standards for the Teaching Profession were adopted by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing in 1996, and the commission had already developed guidelines for new administrative preparation. In 1995, according to *Ed Source* (2001), the agency adopted the Standards of Program Quality and Effectiveness for the Administrative Services Credential Program. This was an update and revision of the Tier I and Tier II programs with a clear requirement for a complete induction program.

> A survey of Tier II credential programs in California reveals that induction (the term for formal orientation and support of new administrators) is required to obtain the credential. However, many in the field say that high quality induction, in the way CTC and its advisory panel originally envisioned it, is not a reality. (Ed Source, 2001, p. 11)

In 2000, the CCTC decided to review the revisions of 1995 and assembled the Administrative Services Task Force at the urging from many public school administrators and their organization (ACSA). Although the ACSA Academies had been approved by CCTC to fulfill a part of the elective dimension of the Tier II Credential requirements, ACSA advocated for more inclusion of the programs and the organization became a primary legislative advocate for the SB 1665 (Scott) bill, which became a major reform effort. In the March 11, 2002, issue of *Ed Cal*, president-elect of ACSA, Superintendent Larry Aceves is quoted,

> The current credentialing process just doesn't work . . . I think there's a place for the institutes of higher education to be involved, and there are some places where

they cannot provide the same level of field experiences that districts, county offices of education or organizations like ACSA can provide. (p. 3)

The outcome of this powerful effort to reconstitute the credentialing program by ACSA resulted in the CCTC sponsored Scott bill (SB 1665). It was such an urgent matter that the bill was expedited to be implemented as soon as the governor signed it, instead of the normal schedule of January 1st. The CCTC bill called for a major reform and reconstitution of the entire administrative services credentialing programs and had six specific provisions which were outlined as objectives of the commission in the form of a staff action plan. The memorandum was labeled, "Recommended Changes in the Preparation and Licensure of Administrator's Professional Services Division" (February 20, 2002), and became the exact template for the legislation. The action plan seemed to be addressing many components of the recommendations by ACSA's *Position Paper in Response to the CTC Review of the Administrative Services Credential* (May 10, 2001). The recommendations of ACSA (June, 2001) entitled *Recruitment and Retention of School Leaders: A Critical State Need* included:

- The training and experiences for the preliminary administrative credential be based on the 'new' California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders (CPSEL).
- Requirements be balanced between theory and practice.
- Programs be geared toward entry-level site and central office administrators.
- The second-level program be radically reconstructed to emphasize job-embedded training of theory and best practices in a manner similar to the

Beginning Teacher and Support and Assessment Program and provide a menu of providers.

- There is an equitable distribution of resources to assess, support, coach and provide professional training. (p. 9)

The exact piece of legislation, SB 1655 (Scott) called for six components:

1. Exempt District Staff from administrative credentials.
2. Recast standards to focus on instructional leadership.
3. Authorize alternative, accredited, standards-based routes to the credential, including local districts.
4. Ensure licensure portability for administrators from other states.
5. Restructure Tier II to focus on mentoring, support, and assistance.
6. Allow capable, experienced individuals to demonstrate their knowledge, skill and abilities through a combination of written and performance based tests.

The descriptive review that follows includes a point-by-point reference to items found in SB 1655 (Scott). An analysis of this expedited bill preparation describes programs to be based on the new standards (CPSEL) [#2], and at the same time endeavors others to provide the flexibility for administrators to hire individuals at the district office with no preparation in school administration (#1). Point three promotes other providers than accredited institutions of higher education and suggests that ACSA, CSLA, the county school's offices, school districts, BTSA, CASBO, or others may become the delivery agencies for the portion of school administration credential requirements. And if alternative delivery agencies were not enough, (#6) it additionally

encourages written and performance-based tests. No university classes, professional development or mentoring would be needed. Credentialed teachers with 3 years of teaching experience could pass a written test and become a principal. Administrators licensed from other states are welcome (#4) and the Professional Administrative Services Credential, Tier II, should be restructured to focus on mentoring, support and assistance.

Senate Bill 1655 is the major reform legislation driving the political agenda to reconstitute the system of administrative preparation credentials. Multiple new agencies and organizations will vie to provide more of the training currently provided by higher education. Additional routes may be provided to certification through testing, exemption (for district positions), and acceptance of credentials from other states.

There is no doubt that there are fewer candidates applying for administrative positions as noted in The ACSA publication article, *Recruitment and Retention . . .* (2001); however, the real question might be, will these reform measures produce the needed effective leaders in these challenging times?

Conclusion

Over the past thirty years, the elected state Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Governor have mandated their priorities for principal training. The state legislature has authored bills for additional prescriptive programs for superintendents and school business officials, and the quasi-independent state agency, the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing, has sponsored a landmark piece of legislation, which fully reconstitutes the credentialing program for school administration. Although the current university programs will remain in place, it will be interesting to see which organizations and agencies will be successful in becoming approved as providers.

As far as the testing or assessment of performance competency is concerned, CCTC has already informally acknowledged that there is only one company that is qualified to perform the appropriate evaluation of school administrators, and that is an east coast corporation which presented to the Commission in January (personal communication, January, 2002).

Recognizing the political posturing and the powerful advocacy efforts that have been made, it is clear that there is a need for some guidelines to be presented to assist in the implementation of the new reform measures. There are concerns politically from some individuals that a single company many be approved as the exclusive testing provider without any open bidding process of the other vendors.

Template for Success

Recommendations for the Preparation for our Future Leaders in Education

1. The California Commission on Teacher Credentialing must play an objective role to maintain high standards in the approval, monitoring, and accreditation of programs.
2. Programs need to provide meaningful balance of theory and practice with a component for praxis (field experience).
3. Pre-Service Programs (Initial Credential, Tier I) need to include rigorous academic experiences and appropriate assessment to ensure the preparation of competent leaders.
4. In-Service, Professional Development programs need to meet the specific needs of individual administrators and include relevant, authentic assessment. (They should continue to be "seat time" as so many currently are.)

5. Measures need to be taken to coordinate programs to avoid duplication and yet still meet preparation standards.
6. No new, additional programs or initiatives should be approved unless they are coordinated with or replace existing programs.
7. There should be regular collaborative activities between and among providers that include state programs, organizations, districts, county offices, and higher education.

The educational community in California public schools has a daunting challenge to meet the needs a very diverse constituency. The shortage of acceptable candidates for administrative positions only compounds the severity of the task at hand. It is hoped that the posturing and politicizing can be put aside and that all the individuals, organizations, agencies, and institutions are able to work together for the needs of our schools with mutual respect and cooperation.

References

ACSA poised as provider of AB 75 training *(2002, July 1). EdCal, 31(29)*, 1-2.

Amendments result in position change on superintendents bill. (July 29, 2002). *Ed Cal*, 32(4), 3.

Assembly Bill 75 (Steinberg), (2001). *Principal training.*

Assembly Bill 2549 (Steinberg). (2002). *Superintendent training.*

Association of California School Administrators. (June, 2001). *Recruitment & retention of school leaders: A critical state need.* Sacramento, CA: Author.

Association of California School Administrators. (October, 1988). *Return to greatness: Strategies for powerful improvements in our schools.* Sacramento, CA: Author.

Bartell, C. A. & Birch, L. W. (1993). *An examination of the preparation, induction, and professional growth of the school administrators for California.* Sacramento: CA. Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (Spring, 2002). California Commission on Teacher Credentialing newsletter. *Commission approves action plan for Administrative preparation reform.* Sacramento, CA: Author.

California Commission on Teacher Credentialing. (February, 2001). *Standards and Effectiveness for administrative services credentials.* Sacramento, CA: Author.

California School Leadership Academy at WestED. (May, 2001). *California professional standards for educational leaders.* Oakland, CA: Author.

Childress, L. (Ed.). (2001). *Principal/site administrator training.* Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA): Riverside County Office of Education: Riverside, CA.

Commission on Teacher Credentialing, State of California. (March, 1995). *Standards of Quality and effectiveness for administrators for administrative services credential Programs.* Sacramento, CA: Author.

Ed Source. (2001). *Help wanted: Top administrators to lead California schools.* Burlingame, CA: Author.

Legislature mulls superintendent training (2002, March 11). *EdCal, 31(29),* 1-2.

National Commission on Excellence on Educational Administration. (1988). *Leaders For American Schools.* Tempe, AZ: The University Council for Educational Administration.

National Association of Elementary School Principals. (1990). *Principals for the 21st Century.* Alexandria, VA: Author.

Senate Bill 850 (Scott), (2002). *School business official training.*

Senate Bill 1655 (Scott), *Teacher credentialing: Administrative services credential.*

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

Reproduction Release
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Reform and Reconstitution of the Educational Administration Program in California: A Study of Politics, Posturing, and the Devaluation of Higher Education	
Author(s): Authors: Stine, D.D. & Stine D.E.	
Corporate Source: CSU San Bernardino	Publication Date: Presented August 2002 at NCPEA Conference

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign in the indicated space following.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY SAMPLE TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
Level 1	Level 2A	Level 2B
☑	☐	☐
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g. electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche, or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Signature: Dr. Deborah E. Stone	Printed Name/Position/Title: Dr. Deborah E. Stone, Assist. Prof.	
Organization/Address: CSUSB 937 West Campus Dr. Upland, CA 91784	Telephone: (909) 98-5670	Fax: (909) 981-5670
	E-mail Address: dstined@aol.com	Date: Sept. 10, 2002

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Document Acquisitions Department
ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management
5207 University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403-5207